

Application/Control Number : 09/830,302  
Art Unit: 2841  
November 26, 2002  
Page 4

Remarks

It is observed that the Examiner still rejected claims 20-22 and 34-37 as being anticipated by US-6,023,889 in the name of Husting.

It is also observed that the Examiner considered claims 23-33 as being allowable provided that they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant had amended claim 20 (which was erroneously indicated as claim 1) in order to recite that the enclosure or door and the shower tray are mutually disconnected and that a free space is defined between the lower edge of the enclosure or door and the upper edge of the shower tray, with the enclosure or door that is arranged within the perimeter of the shower tray.

The Examiner considered such recitation as being new subject-matter added in the course of the examination.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with such opinion since it is believed that the apparently new features are in reality well illustrated in the drawing figures and present since the filing of the application.

Turning for example to figure 8, it can be appreciated that a free space is defined between the lower edge 53 of the enclosure or door and an upper edge 32 of the shower tray 3, with the enclosure or door that is arranged within the perimeter of the shower tray (the perimeter is defined by the upper edge 32).

In addition, the specification on page 6, lines 7-14 recites as follows: "*Below the enclosure 2, and spaced from the lower peripheral rim 53 thereof, the shower tray 3 is rested on the ground and has, at least an arc-like side designated by the reference*

Applicati n/Control Number : 09/830,302  
Art Unit: 2841  
November 26, 2002  
Page 5

*numeral 31, a peripheral rim 32 which is raised with respect to an internal useful surface designated by the reference numeral 33.*

*The raised peripheral rim 32 has, in a transverse cross-section, a configuration which curves upward and increases in height advantageously in the part that lies under the door 9".*

Thus, it is strongly submitted that no new subject-matter has been introduced in amended claim 1 which is herewith still submitted now correctly numbered as claim 20 and not as claim 1.

The arguments submitted with the applicant's letter in response to the first Office Action should be reconsidered by the Examiner in view of the previous demonstration of full support for the amendments introduced in claim 20.

It will be noted that a sincere effort has been made to positively respond to all of the points raised by the Examiner.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Guido MODIANO  
(Reg. No. 19,928)  
Agent for the Applicant  
Via Meravigli 16  
20123 MILAN-ITALY  
Tel. +39.02.8590-7777

Milan: November 27, 2002

Official  
FAX RECEIVED  
NOV 27 2002  
GROUP 3600